

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited.

Claims 22 through 45 are pending, with Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 being independent. Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 have been amended.

Claims 25 through 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite. All rejections are respectfully traversed, and are submitted to have been obviated by the amendment of the claims in a manner earnestly believed to avoid the grounds of rejection, viz, the objected-to “conversion unit” has been deleted.

Claims 22 through 39 were variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent Nos. 6,157,650 (Okuyama, et al.), 6,453,110 B1 (Kawamura, et al.), 5,579,239 (Freeman, et al.), and 6,131,130 (Van Ryzin). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 variously recite, inter alia, a communication apparatus with decoding the first encoded video data received by the first communication into video data and encoding the video data from the decoding unit into second video data using a second video encoding system, in combination with receiving and transmitting and a wireless network and a wired network as claimed.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that none of Okuyama, et al., Kawamura, et al., Freeman, et al., and Van Ryzin, even in the proposed combinations, assuming, arguendo, that the documents could be combined, discloses or suggests at least the above-discussed claimed combinations of features as recited, inter alia, in Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37. The Official Action notes that Okuyama, et al. fails to show the decoding and encoding, and therefore relies upon the other documents. However,

Applicants respectfully submit that there has been no showing of any indication of motivation in the cited documents that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at the above-discussed claimed combinations of features. In this regard, Applicants respectfully traverse the assertion in the Official Action that the artisan would have attempted to modify Okuyama, et al. with Kawamura, et al.'s video decoder 42 and video encoder 45 so as to arrive at Applicants' invention.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C., office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants

Daniel S. Glueck

Registration No. 37,838

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200
DSG/lip

DC_MAIN 202611v1